

# Comrade Nihar Mukherjee Pinpoints Ten Demands For Free And Fair Elections

On 18th January, '77 (at 9 P.M.) Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary of SUCI while issuing a statement to the press on the coming election said :

"We have just come to know from the announcement of the Prime Minister that the present Lok Sabha is being dissolved, elections are going to be held sometime in March and some of the restrictions imposed during the Emergency are going to be relaxed.

We strongly feel that for holding free and fair elections what is of supreme importance that merits topmost priority along with others is the creation of congenial democratic atmosphere in the country. And for this it is incumbent on the part of the government to take the initiative first. It is our considered opinion that in order to create a healthy congenial and democratic atmosphere in the country the following ten points should be implemented without any further delay. They are :—

- 1) Lifting of Emergency ;
- 2) Immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners without discrimination ;
- 3) Withdrawal of all warrants of arrests and cases against political workers ;
- 4) Withdrawal of all restrictive measures imposed on political parties and democratic mass movements ;
- 5) Restoration of freedom of press and newspapers ;
- 6) Revocation of pre-censorship ;
- 7) Restoration of Civil Liberties ;
- 8) Restoration of fundamental and democratic rights of the people ;
- 9) Providing same and equal rights and opportunities as enjoyed by the ruling party to all opposition parties irrespective of recognised or registered parties and even to independent candidates in the matter of conducting ideological campaigns, propagating political views and ideological criticisms as against slander, calumny etc.
- 10) Giving equal scope and opportunities to ventilate their point of view in full through publicity media like newspapers, news agency, radio, television etc."

## Kerala Comrades Are Subjected To Regular Harassment By The Police

(By a staff reporter)

It is heard that relaxations of restrictions have started taking place since long even before the decision of holding elections in the month of March by the Prime Minister. But we are constrained to note that some facts speak to the contrary. We are giving below only a few incidents which will show how the S.U.C.I. organisers and comrades in the state of Kerala are subjected to regular and continued harassment by the police.

On 28th December last Comrade J. James, Secretary Kerala Unit SUCI was summoned to Deputy SP's office and interrogated for hours about the organisational details of Kerala.

On 31st December another Comrade, A. Jalaluddin was summoned similarly in the same office and interrogated in the same fashion.

On 5th January '77 Comrade Yesudasan who came to attend the AIDSO anniversary meeting on 28th December '76 at Calcutta was similarly interrogated on AIDSO affairs.

Comrade V. Natarajan was of course spared owing to his illness.

On 12th January all the three above comrades were again wanted by the police

(Contd. to Page 5)

## CENTRAL COMMITTEE'S APPEAL To All Opposition Parties To Forge Broadest Possible Unity In The Coming Elections To Restore, Defend and Extend Democratic Rights and Civil Liberties of the People

Calcutta 30th January 1977 :

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Centre of India, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, the General Secretary, in course of issuing a statement to the press on the coming election has said :—

"The Central Committee of the SUCI notes with dismay that despite declaration of holding elections and assurances to relax certain rules of Emergency, thousands of opposition leaders and workers including Comrade Shankar Singh, a member of the Central Committee, SUCI, Secretary Bihar State Committee of the Party and a prominent mass leader, and a good number of SUCI leaders, organisers and workers of different States are still inside the jails. Emergency has not been lifted, warrants of arrests and cases against many others not withdrawn, Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matters Act still remains in vogue, or in short the entire opposition has still been deprived of the scope of free movement indispensable for a free and fair election. Never before the Indian people faced a poll under such a suffocating situation. So restoration, preservation of civil liberties and democratic rights of the people have objectively become the focal point of the coming election.

"The present situation marked by such unprecedented negation of civil liberties and democratic rights of the common people through curtailment of fundamental rights, imposition of spate of restrictive measures and by various other means calls for, in the interests of the people, the broadest possible unity of all those forces who truly and firmly stand committed to restore, defend and extend these rights with a view to creating a congenial democratic atmosphere in the country.

(Contd. to Page 5)

## Release All Political Prisoners And Withdraw All Warrants— Com. Nihar Mukherjee's Statement to the Press

Calcutta 25th January 1977 : Demanding immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners including the leaders and workers of SUCI in different States as also withdrawal of all warrants of arrests on political ground. Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI while issuing a statement to the press said :—

"Even after the declaration that the Central Government has instructed the state Governments to release all political prisoners we find to our dismay that upto this date numbers of SUCI leaders and organisers including Comrade Shankar Singh, a member of the Central Committee of our Party and the Secretary, Bihar State Committee have not yet been released.

"Among the many other SUCI workers who have still been kept detained in jails special mention must be made of Comrades Rameswar Upadhyay (Bihar), Dhurjati Das and Benudhar Das (Orissa) and Bilwant Singh and Hussier Singh (Haryana).

"Warrants of arrest against numbers of SUCI workers in different States including some State leaders of Orissa have not yet been withdrawn.

"We demand immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners including the SUCI leaders and workers and withdrawal of all warrant on political ground forthwith".

# Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Founder Editor-in-Chief—COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

# WHY SUCI

## —The Only Genuine Communist Party On Our Soil

[ Continued from Last Issue dated January 15, 1977 ]

**It is the national bourgeoisie that becomes transformed into monopoly bourgeoisie with the development of capitalism**

Naturally the pertinent question that arises now is—who are these big bourgeoisie leading the bourgeois landlord state? They said that the big bourgeoisie was the monopoly capitalist class that collaborated with imperialism. That is why their fight was against the monopoly capitalism and feudalism and not against the national bourgeoisie as such. Thus by characterising the monopoly capitalist class as the collaborator of imperialism what they attempted was to differentiate them from the national bourgeoisie. The question that now comes up, if monopoly capital exists in India, which they too are forced to admit to-day then where this monopoly capital has come from? Has it fallen from the heaven? Lenin has shown clearly in his "imperialism—the highest stage of capitalism" that capitalism always comes with two inherent tendencies. First, Capitalism in its earlier stage remains national in character and strives hard for the establishment of a sovereign national state. Secondly, this national capital in course of its development gives birth to monopoly and capitalism becomes cosmopolitan and acquires imperialist character at this stage of its development. Thus according to Leninism it is the national bourgeoisie that becomes transformed into monopoly bourgeoisie in course of development of capitalism. So to admit that monopoly capitalism has grown in India means, according to Marxism-Leninism, to admit the fact that, however weak and relatively backward it may be, compared to the affluent and traditional western imperialist countries, the Indian capitalism has not only given birth to national capital but in course of development it has itself, through the formation of monopoly capital, already acquired imperialist character as well. Naturally, to say that the big bourgeoisie i.e. the monopoly capitalist class is heading the state means according to Marxism-Leninism, that it is the national bourgeoisie which is at the helm of the state. So, judged in the context of specific national and international situation obtaining at present, how can anyone deny the existence of an independent sovereign national state in India?

**The Indian National Bourgeoisie is firmly established in the State Power and the state is being led by it**

Secondly, while characterising the Indian state, they hold that it is the big bourgeoisie, the monopoly capitalist class which is in the state power and who, according to them, is compradore bourgeoisie or the stooges of imperialism and not the national bourgeoisie. But they in the same breath are saying that contradiction and conflict between the Indian national bourgeoisie and the imperialist powers in the economic field is being intensified so much so and the influence of the national bourgeoisie on the state and the government has grown to such an extent that these are finding expressions in the anti-imperialist and pro-peace independent foreign policy of the Indian state under the leadership of the Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru himself. So, if the over-riding influence and control of the national bourgeoisie over the state and the government is admitted and the character of the state is defined as a "bourgeois-landlord state headed by big bourgeoisie" as has been defined by them, then whom they are calling 'big bourgeoisie' cannot be in fact other than the national bourgeoisie, and it is they who are firmly established in state power to-day.

**Indian Monopoly Capitalist Class is a Junior partner of the International Imperialist Trust and Cartel.**

Thirdly, had they possessed even a rudimentary understanding about Marxist-Leninist theory of imperialism, they would have easily understood that if the Indian monopoly capital was a stooge of imperialism, then such a stooge or satellite of imperialism could not be a member or partner of the international trust and cartel which are nothing but international economic organisations of the imperialists. But fact remains that the Indian monopoly capitalist class is already a partner of such international trust and cartel, the international economic organisations of monopoly finance capital—may be a junior



partner but still a partner and a competitor too. So, judged from all aspects, it is clear that it is this very Indian national bourgeoisie who has transformed itself into monopoly finance capital in the course of its development and who being firmly established at the state power is standing as the main obstacle in the path of emancipation of the exploited people of our country. If the national bourgeoisie is considered as an ally of revolution, then such a revolution can never mean the overthrow of the present state structure. Therefore, fight against the monopoly capitalist class means in reality a fight against the national bourgeoisie. Naturally, when the national bourgeoisie is standing as the main enemy of Indian revolution and when the revolution can only be accomplished by overthrowing this very national bourgeoisie from state power, then, how can this national bourgeoisie be an ally of the revolution—is a matter which should better be left to the 'theoreticians' of that party to explain! This is really beyond the comprehension of a genuine Marxist-Leninist! Only one question remains left to be considered here. That is, as to how best we can handle the contradiction that exists between monopoly capital and small production in our country and taking advantage of this contradiction how far we can use small production in favour of revolution which the revolutionaries in all the countries strive to do. There may be differences as to the tactical aspects of it. But what has that got to do with the question of considering the national bourgeoisie as a class an ally in the strategic alliance of revolution when this very national bourgeoisie has already been transformed into monopoly capitalist class and against whom the revolutionary struggle has to be directed and without overthrowing whom revolution cannot be accomplished?

Even after all these, if they still cling to their pet theory that the national bourgeoisie is an ally of their 'revolution' then the very object of such a revolution can in no way mean the overthrow of the present capitalist state machine, rather it boils down to nothing else than the programme of parliamentary election battles within the framework of a national bourgeois state and their ideal of 'revolution' is thus reduced to empty talks and meaningless slogans—which their cadres and theoreticians have so hopelessly failed to grasp.

It is, therefore, clear that the absurd contradiction between their theory and practice which became vivid in their political stand and behaviour since the Madurai Congress, the contradiction which once became palpable, earlier in 1948 at the time of Ranadive, when they were to conduct struggles directly against the state, could not be resolved by them even at the Palghat Congress. This self-contradiction became more acute when in the Amritswar Congress after Palghat going a step further they declared that forming a 'national front' in alliance with the national bourgeoisie, they could achieve People's Democratic Revolution not only peace



fully but even by Parliamentary means. Because by this declaration they had openly admitted the independent and active role of Indian Parliament. But how a parliament can have such an independent role without having a sovereign national bourgeois state as its base, they did neither care to explain nor did they accept the Indian state as a sovereign bourgeois national state. In the Amritsar Congress also their characterisation of the Indian state remained the same—"a bourgeois landlord state headed by big bourgeoisie"—and the strategy of revolution, remained the same old 'People's Democratic Revolution'.

**No fundamental theoretical question was involved in the formation of CPI(M) after the split with CPI.**

Moving with this self-contradiction crisis developed within the party, centering round the Sino-Indian border conflict. Group squabbles were all along there inside the party. The so-called "revolutionary group" led by Ranadive which was so long subdued during both Ajoy Ghosh's and after him Dange's leadership found an opportunity before them to organise a separate party exploiting the sentiment of proletarian internationalism of a portion of the rank and file members of the party which manifested itself centring round the Sino-Indian border conflict, came out of the old party branding "Dange Clique" and "Joshi Clique" as revisionists and formed a new party—the CPI(M). I have dealt at length the history of this party before the formation of CPI(M) and you have seen that all the present leaders of the CPI(M) were no less committed to the policies and political stards of the old party. Be that as it may, let us now examine whether the basic theoretical differences which the CPI(M) leadership claimed to have existed when they came out of the old party and formed the new party in 1964, really involved any fundamental theoretical question or whether these were merely some differences on tactical questions and in vocabularies which they posed as major theoretical differences.

In the First Congress of the CPI(M) at Calcutta which they declared as the Seventh Congress in continuation to that of the old Party, and necessarily carrying its heritage there too while characterising the Indian state, they echoed the same old formulation of the revisionists: "It is a bourgeois-land lord state headed by the big bourgeoisie". The strategy of revolution adopted at this Party Congress remained as before the same anti-imperialist, anti-feudal Peoples' Democratic Revolution. In the class alignment of revolutionary forces, they too, considered the national bourgeoisie and the rich peasants i.e. the village jotedars as allies of their revolution. They even went so far as to mention in their political report of the Congress that they visualised the possibility of a peaceful revolution in the concrete Indian situation. The difference boiled down to this point only—who composed these national bourgeoisie? Were they to be found within the Congress or outside? The whole difference between the two parties was over this assessment. CPI held that the section within the Congress led by Jawaharlal was in fact representing the national bourgeoisie. CPI(M), on the contrary, took the stand that the Congress as a whole was a stooge of imperialism, a collaborator, an organisation of the monopoly capitalists having no place for the national bourgeoisie. But if the national bourgeoisie were not inside the Congress, then, who are these national bourgeoisie and what is their political organisation question. CPI(M) leadership preferred to keep mum on these very pertinent questions.

On the other hand, like the CPI, they too recognised in reality the existence of an independent state in India, although they did not do it in writing or in any of their public statements. Besides, the national bourgeoisie whom both the CPI and the CPI(M) considered progressive and deemed as an ally of their "revolution"—whether with them there should be a "national front" or a "united front" on issue to issue, such was the point of their much trumpeted "fundamental" difference at the time of the split.

Thus it is observed that just as the revisionists did at Palghat the CPI(M) leaders too, differentiated the national bourgeoisie from the monopoly capitalist class by characterising the latter as "big bourgeoisie" and stooges of imperialism. But just now I have made it amply clear that this 'big bourgeoisie' whom they are branding as 'monopoly capitalist class' the "collaborators" with imperialism are none else than the national bourgeoisie who in fact became transformed into monopoly capitalist class in course of development of the capitalist economy of our country. Naturally, by holding the national bourgeoisie as an ally of their revolution, their revolution too like that of the CPI was bound to remain a revolution in verbiage and in reality they would continue to practise and remain totally engrossed in parliamentary politics in spite of mouthing revolutionary slogans at

the sametime—which has been already very much reflected in their day to day behaviour. But the Congress which they now depict as totally reactionary and stooge of imperialism, they would discover in course of time a section of progressive bourgeoisie in it and would unite with it at times and oppose at others to suit their exigency.

[ Later on, the CPI(M) leaders at the Burdwan Plenum admitted that the influence of the national bourgeoisie on the Indian state and the government was on the increase. When the Congress split into two—the "Indicate" and the "Syndicate"—the CPI(M) considered the Indira wing of Congress as relatively progressive compared to the "Syndicate" faction. They hailed the Bank Nationalisation by Indira Gandhi as a "progressive" measure and "one step forward" and even went to conclude that it was the "anti-monopoly", "pro-people democratic forces" within the Indira Congress that were going in strength. Moreover, when the Naxalites coming out of the CPI(M) stated to propagate the theory of People's Democratic Revolution on lines similar to those of the document adopted in 1951 at Madurai, characterising the Indian state as semi-colonial and semi-feudal and stated that the independence of India was merely a formal one, Ranadive, while combating them through one of his writings even went so far as to declare that the very national bourgeoisie which had led the freedom movement was now established in the state power in India. He thereby admitted that the Indian state instead of being a semi-colonial, semi-feudal one, is an independent national sovereign state. Then how can an independent national state be other than an independent sovereign bourgeois state? But even after observing that the national bourgeoisie was in the state power Mr. Ranadive said in his conclusion that: However, the object of our revolution remains anti-imperialist, anti-feudal—as it was in Madurai. To admit that it is the "national bourgeoisie which is in the state power" and to characterise in the next breath that the same national bourgeoisie is an ally of revolution cannot but raise a pertinent question as to whether their "revolution" meaning People's Democratic Revolution at all implies overthrow of the present state machine? Otherwise, how the national bourgeoisie which according to Ranadive is in state power, and the rural rich peasants can be deemed as allies of their revolution? The answer to this question should better be left to the theoreticians of Ranadive's "standing" and his revolutionary compatriots! Thus it is proved that with regard to the fundamental theoretical questions of revolution i.e. the question of evaluation of the stage of revolution, character of the state and the alignment of revolutionary class forces, the CPI(M) had no difference with the CPI at the time of their split nor they have any now—Added at the time of publication of the speech in Bengali book form—E. I. P. Era.]

Another "fundamental difference", which they used to speak of very loudly, to be responsible for the split of the party was that the CPI(M) considered the Soviet Union as out and out revisionist in the international sphere and it was the Chinese party that was pursuing a correct revolutionary line. Therefore, the CPI(M) at that time took a pro Chinese position. But they have changed this position since then. The CPI(M) now holds that the CPC was correct upto 14th June letter but has deviated since then. According to CPI(M), CPC is now suffering from dogmatism and practising the cult of individual in Mao Tse-Tung which has nothing to do with Marxism. They are saying all these practically in the same manner as of the revisionists, with slight difference here and there. They are, of course, careful in coining of words so that the rank and file members cannot detect that their position has become today, identical with the revisionists. Their present position is that they are neutral—neither pro-Chinese nor pro-Soviet. But despite all their hue and cry against revisionism and despite their anti-Dange slogans, they are, as I have already told, surreptitiously trying to develop friendship and intimacy with the Soviet Union. But because of the opposition of the CPI from outside and of their rank and file from inside they have not been successful yet to proceed much in this direction. Mouthing "revolutionary" slogans against revisionism, they are trying to befriend those European parties like the Rumanian Party—a party that is more rightist than even the CPSU in its revisionist outlook. Not only they are maintaining liason with such a party but both of them are very much appreciative of each other. And even then the Dangeites are revisionists in the eyes of the CPI(M)!

It is, therefore, clear that although the CPI(M) leaders formed a new party on the plea of and raising high sounding slogans about "fundamental difference" on theoretical questions with the CPI, they had, in reality, no such difference. It was mainly due to group squabbles that they formed this new party which differed only on minor tactical approach and certain vocabularies. And whatever little difference the CPI(M) had in their tactical approach with the CPI at the time of the split it is almost absent today excepting some local conflicts here and there manifested in day to day movements.

( To Be Concluded )

## ON THE PRESENT SITUATION IN WEST-ASIA

Peace loving people all over the world have been seriously wanting a just solution to the Palestinian problem which was created by the imperialists by brutally driving away and butchering some two millions Arab inhabitants from their home land of Palestine. Whatever might be the history behind the creation of the state of Israel, the existence of the state of Israel is now a reality which no right-thinking man can deny. But the solution to the Palestinian question could have been found out by accepting this reality if the imperialists did not intervene to serve their nefarious ends. Centering round the Palestinian question the imperialists again and again launched wars of aggression against the countries of the Middle East with a view to maintaining and strengthening their control over this oil rich area of immense strategic importance. At present the imperialists are speaking of peaceful solution to the Palestinian question selling the idea of formation of a Palestinian state comprising of the West Bank and the Gaza strip. But this deceptive peace move of the imperialists is nothing but a camouflage to serve the same imperialist interest of subjugating the people of Palestine in particular and of the Middle East in general.

The Palestinians have been resisting all these attempts of the imperialists and fighting against the conspiracy hatched out by the imperialist through Israel. Centering round the liberation struggle of the Palestinians a militant pan-Arabism grew up among the various Arab states and this pan-Arabism played an important role in anti-imperialist and specially anti-U.S. imperialist struggle. Though it is a fact that the individual bourgeois states of the Middle East pursued an internal policy of suppressing the progressive movement and forces yet it was due to this tide of pan Arabism that these states had to maintain anti-imperialist stand. The militant unity of the Arab people centering round the question of the Palestinians was the greatest stumbling block to the imperialists in their nefarious game and so the imperialists devised a grand plan to break the Arab unity on one hand and to corner and subsequently eliminate on the other hand the hardliners—notably George Habash's Popular Front for the liberation of Palestine from the Palestinian Liberation Organisation. With this objective in view the imperialists pursued the parrot and stick policy. In 1967, the imperialists-backed Israel badly mauled

the Arab states to which the Soviet Union failed to supply the necessary strategic weapons. In '73 war also Egypt was forced to accept a most humiliating ceasefire resolution sponsored by the USA and the USSR at the United Nations Organisations. In every succeeding war in the Middle East the role of the Soviet Union became gradually clear to the Arab states and the Arab states realised that the Soviet Union was not ready to help them to the extent necessary to force a defeat militarily on Israel. They also realised that military involvement brought only defeat in its trail much to the discomfiture of their own internal economies. The above together with the fact that the bourgeois leadership of these resurgent nationalist countries cannot play a consistent anti-imperialist role because of their class character in this epoch, they sought the help of the US imperialists who could alone control Israel and thus was in a position to help the Arab states in getting back their lost territory. With this aim in view, Mr. Anwar Sadat of Egypt signed the Sinai Accord with Israel at the mediation of the US imperialists. This unilateral act of Egypt was sharply criticised by some of the Arab states but it was the first victory of the "step by step" policy of the US imperialists. The

imperialists were also attempting to contain the Palestinians as unless these Palestinians are contained the imperialist policy of ruling over the Middle East will be jeopardised. The different Arab states were also realising that the Palestinian question could not be solved militarily in absence of direct Soviet backing. So these Arab states started thinking the Palestinian problem as a thorn in their way and so they became eager to somehow solve this question. The Palestinians were first driven off from Jordan and then from Egypt and then from Syria and these hapless Palestinians were taking their last refuge in Lebanon. The imperialists started their game in Lebanon to drastically curtail the fighting power of the Palestinians. At first the christian community was incited to crack down on the Palestinians but the toiling people of Lebanon sided with the Palestinians and a bloody civil war ensued. In this civil war the toiling people of Lebanon along with the Palestinians were on the verge of victory when Syria militarily intervened to tilt the military balance in favour of the phalangist, the imperialist backed fascist organisation. The Syrian army butchered the Palestinians by machine-gunning the innocent people and after 18 months of carnage in Lebanon with 69,000 deaths and more than 50 failed ceasefire, the 56th truce agreement was signed by the different Arab States and the Palestinian representatives at an Arab summit at Riyadh. The latest ceasefire worked in the northern area of Lebanon but in the southern sector the christian forces attacked Muslim towns in the border area long known as "Fata land". Under the terms of the agreement signed at Riyadh, the Palestinian guerillas must withdraw from the Beirut area and naturally many would have to go to Southern Lebanon. But

the Israelis are helping the phalangists of Lebanon to keep the southern part of Lebanon free from the Palestinians. Israel which has already given arms and even tanks—38 US built Shermans and 33 captured Soviet T-54s—to the phalangists, moved several steps further. Israeli helicopters flew ammunition to christians attacking the town of Marjayoun and ferried out casualties to Israeli hospitals. Israeli paratroops took up cross roads positions around Marjayoun to block off Palestinian reinforcement and Israeli along the border provided fire support to the phalangist attackers. It is also reported that the Israelis have also provided them with a small navy to intercept ships heading for Sidon, the remaining part under the control of the Palestinians.

The Riyadh Agreement is a bitter defeat of the Palestinians. The Palestinians suffered losses on the battlefield as well as on the diplomatic front. The grand plan to break the Arab unity and to isolate the hard liners within the PLO worked well and with this latter objective the Syrian President, Mr. Assad and the moderate leader of the Palestinians Mr. Arafat sat together in the Syrian capital and agreed that the hard line 'rejectionist' elements in the Palestinian movement under the leadership of Habash were to be eliminated to ensure peace. To eliminate the hardliners from the Palestinian movement, the moderate leadership must be wooed and in course of his press interview Mr. Anwar Sadat, the Egyptian President, disclosed the plan. He said that it was important to offer the Palestinians something that their moderate leaders could sell to their own people, like a West Bank-Gaza state. So it is clear that the idea of the fractured state of Palestine is being mooted in order to blunt the militant liberation struggle of the Palestinians by wedging a rift within the PLO and

this is being accomplished by the imperialists with the help of the leaders of those very Arab countries which once forged a militant unity against the imperialists at the call of the Palestinian liberation movement. What a great set back to the cause of the Palestinian liberation struggle! All the peace loving people of the world desired that the solution to the Palestinian question is to be achieved by giving defeat to the imperialists through forging militant anti-imperialist unity of the Arab people. But this desire of the peace loving people of the world is going to be belied. The Palestinian question is going to be solved through the mediation of the U.S. imperialists who have mooted the idea of the West Bank-Gaza state. While commenting on the civil war in Lebanon in a previous issue of the Proletarian Era, we apprehended such a fractured state of Palestine for the containment of the Palestinians and that is perhaps going to happen now.

Previously on many occasions we discussed how the policy of the Soviet revisionist leadership helped the imperialist in gaining control over the Middle East affairs. The militant anti-imperialist tone as reflected in the Suez episode of the early fifties disappeared completely as the revisionists usurped the leadership of Soviet communist party. Through the successive wars in the Middle East, it has been clear that the Soviet revisionist leadership does not want to confront the U.S. imperialist in the Middle East. In Arab-Israel war of '67 the defeat of the Arab countries was due to the failure on the part of the Soviet Union to supply the necessary strategic arms to them to combat Israel backed by the US imperialists with all the latest weapons. The US imperialists correctly sensed the nature of Soviet response prior to the attack and it there was any

(Contd. to Page 5)



## NOW

**"It's not material whether the left defeats the Congress or the non-lefts"**

—Mr. Jyoti Basu

"According to information received in Calcutta, the CPI(M) leader, Mr. Jyoti Basu, had a meeting in Delhi with some prominent leaders of the West Bengal Janata Party. Both Mr. Basu and the Marxist Party's West Bengal Committee Secretary Mr. Promode Dasgupta, are now in Delhi in connection with the Politburo and central committee meetings of the CPI(M).

"Mr. Basu reportedly told the West Bengal Janata leaders that there was "perfect unanimity" of

views between them as to the importance of defeating the Congress. It was learnt that Mr. Basu maintained that "it is not material whether the left defeats the Congress or the non-lefts.

"Mr. Basu was further told (by Janata Party leaders) that if a poll alliance was not possible in West Bengal between CPI(M) and the Janata Party there would surely be an adjustment.....Care would be taken to see that a Janata candidate does not contest a Marxist candidate in any of the 42 West Bengal seats".

Hindusthan Standard, 27.1.77.

## AND THEN

**"At best (it is) an election manoeuvre that would bring no good to the people"**

—CPI(M) Polit Bureau

"The Polit Bureau of the CPI(M) notes that the efforts at forming what is called a single viable opposition party have reached an advanced stage. The Congress (O), the Bharatiya Lok Dal, the Jana Sangh and the Socialist Party together with a section of the "Left Congressmen" who were recently expelled from the ruling Congress Party..... are reported to have decided in favour of merging their respective parties and groups into a single political party.

"The CPI(M) has never subscribed and does not subscribe today, to the formation of a single party by the amalgamation of disparate parties, groups and elements differing in politics, programme and outlook in order to confront the ruling Congress. It is neither principled nor will it be enduring, such a party cannot provide the alternative, needed by the people. At best an election manoeuvre that would bring no good to the people.

...That was why the party had refused to have anything to do with the

so-called Grand Alliance formed in the year 1970-71 and described it as another reactionary combination".

[CPI(M) Polit Bureau on the proposed merger of four parties—People's Democracy Nov. 7, 1976]

**"Unable to participate due to inclusion of reactionary parties"**

—Central Committee of CPI(M)

"The C. C. while according full support to the popular demands and the movement in Bihar, is unable to participate in the Bihar Jana Sangharsh Samiti or in the All India Co-ordination Committee due to the inclusion and active participation of avowedly reactionary parties like the Jana Sangh, B. L. D., Congress (O), the policies and programmes of which are against the interests of the people.

"Unfortunately, neither J.P. nor the other left parties could yet be convinced by our party about the dangers of associating with the parties of reactionary opposition and the need to exclude them and to build up a left and democratic alternative."

[Resolution adopted on December—4. 9. 74. On Bihar Movement (People's Democracy, December 15, 1974).

## On The Present Situation In West Asia

(Contd. from Page 4)

chance of stiff soviet attitude, the US imperialists would not have dared to take recourse to such an adventurous course. But the US imperialists correctly understood that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union would not take any such action which would bring them in direct confrontation with the US imperialists in the Middle East. The result was the humiliation of the Arab world. During the '73 war also the Soviet revisionist leadership co-sponsored with the US imperialists a most humiliating ceasefire resolution at UN and this was thrust upon Egypt at her most disadvantageous moment. What will the Soviet revisionist leadership answer if they are charged that they did it with a view to give concession to Israel? Is it not due to their global policy of hegemonism? The policy of the Soviet revisionist leadership ultimately became instrumental in breaking the Arab unity. Not only that. Progressive people all over the world saw with wonder that the Syrians were using the Soviet arms with impunity against the Palestinians in Lebanon, whose cause the Soviet Union was committed to support. Instead of restraining Syria against the use of Soviet arms, Mr. Kosygin, the Soviet Premier was promising continued military aid to Syria at Damascus on the day following Syrian invasion over Lebanon. The Soviet revisionist leadership failed to realise where they had landed themselves by pursuing the policy of hegemonism. Had the Palestinian liberation struggle been correctly handled, a firm unity of the Arab people against imperialism would have been forged on the basis of pan-Arabism and the liberation struggle of not only the Palestinians but the people of the whole of Middle East would have been accelerated also. It is due to this weak-kneed policy of the Soviet revisionist leadership, that the unity of the Arab states against imperialism

was shattered and even the imperialist game of creating a rift within the PLO by segregating the hardliners and wooing the moderate leadership, succeeded to the glee of the imperialists. The shameless policy of hegemonism pursued by the Soviet revisionist leadership turned this excellent situation pregnant with immense possibilities into a victory, albeit temporary, of the US imperialists.

The anti-imperialist liberation struggle of the people of the Middle East has received a serious

set back. The dangerous role played by the Soviet revisionist leadership is a lesson not only to the people of the West Asia, but to the oppressed people of the whole of the world also who are fighting against imperialism-capitalism and all sorts of exploitation for the liberation of their respective countries. So defeat of all trends and varieties of modern revisionism is an essential precondition for the success of liberation struggle in any country at the present time.

## UTUC (Lenin Sarani) On Recent Amendment To Bonus Act

Comrade Fatick Ghosh, General Secretary, UTUC (Lenin Sarani) West Bengal State Committee, has stated the following on the recent amendment to Bonus Act:

"The Bonus ordinance (subsequently the Act) that came close on the hue of the proclamation of Internal Emergency took away the hard-earned rights of the workers to the minimum rate of bonus of 8½%. Bonus, which had

for decades, been held by the highest judicial body in the country, as deferred wages, was tagged by the said Act, with productivity and profit declared by the capitalists. The recent amendment that comes on the eve of snap poll, cannot in our opinion, deceive the working people as it does not restore the rightful claim, the workers had been enjoying for decades".

## CENTRAL COMMITTEE'S APPEAL

(Contd. from Page 1)

"In order to present such a united face of all such opposition parties and forces to meet the attacks on the democratic rights, values and the people by the ruling party, it is incumbent, not only to have an adjustment of seats for defeating the ruling Congress at the Polls, but in order to make this defeat purposetul, to adopt also such programme which would ensure restoration and preservation of civil liberties and democratic rights of the people.

"This necessitates immediate sitting of all such opposition parties and adoption of such programme and also the criteria on the question of allotment of seats that can genuinely reflect the present organisation strength of different parties necessary to ensure defeat of the ruling Congress and also selecting such candidates who are genuinely honest, sincere and dependable defenders of civil liberties and democratic rights of the people, upholding a high standard of democratic values and norms.

"So, the Central Committee directs all the state Committees to explore all avenues to achieve the above objective".

## RELEASE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS

(Contd. from Page 1)  
authorities for another round of interrogation.

Comrades, J. James, V. Natarajan and Jalaluddin have been asked not to leave station without intimating the local police authorities.

Over and above, it is to be mentioned that in the District of Quilon all

public collections have been banned. In fact public collections has recently been banned throughout the entire state of Kerala. It may be recalled that in our issue dated 1st October 1976 we had referred to the treatment which was meted out to our party by the Kerala Government.

## Neo-Malthusian Bogey— A Sign Of Decay Of Capitalism

The world capitalist order has been in the vortex of very many problems generated by the very exploitative system, the symptoms of which are manifesting in mounting unemployment, fast growing poverty of the masses, food crisis etc. These are in fact the signs of decay of capitalism which is moribund and has been passing through third phase of intense crisis which is overall crisis.

Faced with this crisis and mounting discontent of the people, the bourgeois politicians are digging up all sorts of obscurantist and obsolete ideas, old and discarded theories of the past in their bid to conceal the basic failure of the capitalist system which they are defending.

Otherwise, how can the neo-Malthusian School stage a come-back to-day with all the air of solemnity in the bourgeois world and more particularly in the so-called developing countries, with the bogey that 'population explosion' is standing as the main hindrance in fighting the chronic ills of unemployment, food problems and poverty of the masses etc. Who does not know that the theory of Malthus in regard to growth of population was proved wrong in as much as it failed to establish validity of its contention that effective demand of the population (return of nature on productive labour of man) does not increase in proportion to the increase of population? It is a contention that has been falsified by concrete experience of history, discarded once even by the bourgeois economists apart from the severe lashings it received from Karl Marx, the great teacher of the proletariat.

It may appear somewhat perplexing as to why the bourgeoisie of the present era are to fall back on this discarded theory but the reason for it is not far off to seek. As we know, in the changed condition in the era of moribund capitalism, the bourgeoisie are adopting such methods with the sole motive of protecting the crisis-ridden capitalist economy and the state by concealing from the people the root cause of such chronic problems as those of unemployment and food etc. obtaining in varying degrees in bourgeois countries.

What is the so-called argument of the neo-Malthusian lobby now active in the bourgeois world? Though nothing new, it chews the cud that a rapid rise in population growth is the villain of the piece so much so that all the developments said to have been made, have been more than offset by this single factor.

In order to show the fallacy and utter hollowness of the contention, in our opinion, not much serious

discourse is needed but some concrete facts will be enough.

Just take the example of our country. Here as one journal comments: "The government continues to be baffled by the problem of plenty in food-grains. Surely, this is an advancement for a country with at least some 250 millions people subsisting at varying levels of starvation."

(Economic & Political Weekly December 11, '76.)

So, can it be validly argued that because of the high population figure of the country, the people are not getting adequate food? This type of argument one could hear before. But in the context of bare facts that on the one hand there is huge accumulation of food stocks and on the other the people have no means to have adequate quantity of food, those who repeated this so-called logic now feel shy to repeat it any more. This single fact speaks more than one thing. It shows that whether there is good stock position of food or not,

this has no relevance to the common people as they have no means to purchase the most essential thing like food. It means that the people are in a social system which fails to ensure either adequate purchasing power or an essential article like food. It is, therefore, the absence of a social means which ensures distribution of essential articles to the people through a widespread public distribution system and a productive system that ensures employment of full human resources that are responsible for the paradox of plenty amidst yawning poverty. Has it got anything to do with the rate of population growth? Why this paradox of plenty of food when millions go hungry? Do the neo-Malthusians dare face this question? We are afraid they would rather avoid meeting this question straight. Why? Because, to face the question they will have to be confronted with the insoluble but inherent contradiction of a capitalist economy. What is that?

The bourgeois politicians and their real masters, the monopolists exhort the working people for increasing the production but when there is even meagre increase in production, the self-contradiction of the bourgeois productive system becomes all the more apparent. The workers face in larger number, loss of employment due to lay-off, lock-out, closure of factories. The bourgeoisie call it 'over production', the actual meaning of which is not that the production has been far more than the social requirement but that the market or the purchasing power of the masses has been proved too inadequate to absorb even that meagre increase of production. The problem is the same—glut of products but no sufficient buyers in the counters. The same picture—may it be in the case of the agricultural products or industrial goods. But the irony is

that the working people are to hear almost daily the very many virtues of production increases whereas in bourgeois society it brings no boon to them, rather it accentuates their miseries. So the villain of the piece is not the rate of population growth but the very capitalist productive system. This plain and simple truth, the defenders of capitalism want to conceal from the masses.

That is why, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our great departed leader and teacher and an outstanding Marxist philosopher and thinker of the era counterposed the neo-Malthusian hacks by pointedly showing that:

What these gentlemen contend can at all deserve any consideration, if and when they give satisfactory explanations as to why, in any bourgeois country, it has not been possible to modernise and mechanise fully with most advanced technique the agricultural operations in order to constantly uplift the standard of living of the masses as also to meet the growing needs of industry; not only this, how is it that the bourgeoisie is resorting to obsolete techniques and small-farming? As to why it has not been possible to stop corruption in administration as also wasteful expenditure on military budget or big shows that neither give prestige nor any proper defence to any famished nation? As to why it has not been possible to put to entire use, the full productive capacity of the industry? As to why in a bourgeois country like ours, it has not yet been possible to nationalise the foodgrains trade so as to ensure minimum requirement of this essential item to all, free from speculative profit? Does population factor stand in any way in meeting all these? Certainly not. But on the other hand they are the symptoms of the very limitations and contradictions of the capitalist system which has failed historically to solve and more so in its present moribund stage. That is the reason for which the

neo-Malthusians dread these very pertinent questions to face and answer squarely.

Now, take another instance. Anybody conversant with facts are well aware that a leading bourgeois country like the Great Britain where the rate of population, of late, has touched zero, faces also a glaring paradox, much to the chagrin of the neo-Malthusians. The people of this land witness that at a time of zero rate of population growth not only that the rate of unemployment has touched the highest ever figure but that the trend shows no sign of abatement, rather shows further drift. What is the answer to this phenomenon? The answer lies in the historic reasons. Capitalism is in decay, it is outliving and that it is failing historically to meet the growing needs of social development. This failure of the system is appearing in the paradoxes. A paradox also for a system which had at one time the sky as the limit for expansion or growth with all the dynamics of life but to-day is afraid of expansion, afraid of growth other than maximum profits.

As against all these sordid experiences of a sick bourgeois world, let us now have a new experience from socialist China—a country of 800 million people, the most populous country in the world that started its journey of emancipation of the masses from poverty, hunger and degradation all around, with the burdens of centuries at its back. But within so short a span of time, this country has freed itself from famine, unemployment, inflation and foreign debt. Have they ever posed that the population factor is the most serious hindrance to their advancement? No, never they have made the population question as the focal point. They have however, rightly sorted out their problem which is the removal of the exploitative productive system and reconstruction of their economy on the

(Contd. to Page 7)



# PROMISE OF WELFARE AND THEN

It is only four years back that people heard the Prime Minister exhorting the business community of adopting a "new economics". She was telling: "development goals should not aim at proliferation of consumer goods or services which benefit only a certain section but must be—defined in terms of progressive reduction and eventual elimination of squalor and inequality, of malnutritious and disease, of illiteracy and unemployment. We must think in terms of minimum goods and services which are to be provided to the common man. In order to eliminate the worst manifestations of poverty."

In order to give effect to this line of thinking, in the draft Fifth Plan there was a "national programme of minimum needs". The PROGRAMME declared as its objective: "a minimum level of social consumption for different areas and sections of the community", covering elementary education, rural health, nutrition,

rural water supply, rural roads, house-sites for landless, slum improvement, rural electrification etc. The importance of this programme was highlighted in the Plan document in a separate chapter, 'Objectives and Policy-frame for the Fifth Plan'.

It was stated there: "one of the basic objectives of the Plan is to raise the consumption levels of the lowest 30 percent of our population."

Now although three of the fifth Five-year Plan years have run, the final version that has only very recently been given to it, has left the high objective i.e. the national programme of minimum needs as well as the chapter on objectives on policy-frame mentioned above.

The size of the plan has been pruned to a considerable extent in so far as outlays on the welfare measures are concerned. The total outlay amounts to Rs. 39,303 crores i.e. only 5% higher than the draft plan figure which hardly compensates the inflation rate. However,

let us see how the final allocations are made.

The outlay on education has suffered reduction as much as by Rs. 441 crores, from Rs 1,726 crores in the draft-plan to Rs 1,285 cr. i.e. by over one-fourth. The outlay on elementary education has got the slashing most in as much as the outlay has come down from Rs 743 cr. to Rs 410 cr. or by 45%. It will be interesting to note in this connection the importance that was once placed on it in the draft plan:

"Apart from being a constitutional obligation, the provision of universal elementary education is crucial for spreading mass literacy, which is basic requirement for economic development, modernisation of the social structure and the effective functioning of democratic institutions. It also represents an indispensable first step towards the provision of equality of opportunity to all citizens. Elementary education has therefore, been given a high priority in the Fifth Plan". But this is no longer.

The same position is with the health programme. The outlay on it has been reduced from Rs 796 crores to 682 crores i.e. a reduction by 14%. Drastic curtailment has been made in the nutrition programme in as much as while the draft programme provided Rs 400 crores it has been reduced to Rs 116 crores in the final plan-outlay. It may be of interest to note what the draft plan had to say on this programme: "In order to attack the problem of malnutrition at its root it will be necessary to take care of pregnant women, lactating mothers and pre-school children of the weaker sections."

The draft-plan therefore proposed: "to extend the nutrition programme substantially during the Fifth Plan period so as to create better nutrition facility for pregnant women, lactating mother, and pre-school children of weaker sections."

Similarly, the allocation on social welfare covering programmes of

family and child welfare of the handicapped, has been reduced to Rs 86 crores from Rs 229 crores, originally proposed. The outlay on urban development has been reduced from Rs. 4716 crores to Rs. 3458 crores or by well-over one fourth. In the draft, these programmes constituted 12.6% but have now been reduced to only 8.8%. Perhaps this is in consonance with the spirit of the government's recent pronouncements and declarations. And after all consistency is a rare commodity in bourgeois politics and it is becoming rarer nowadays.

It is in this background, BLITZ comments: "We find it hard to believe that Rs. 50 crores has been allocated in order to modernise the police force in the country, whilst only Rs. 8 crores has been provided in the Fifth Plan for rehabilitation of destitute children whose number runs into several thousands."—December, 11, '76.

## WHO PROFITS BY PRICE HIKE

The economy of our country guided by the law of monopoly capitalism

### Neo-Malthusian Bogey

(Contd. from Page 6)

basis of socialist law of production. What is of cardinal difference, therefore, is the basic superiority of the socialist system. It is the scientific socialism that alone has provided the historic answer to all the paradoxes and contradictions, the bourgeois world suffers from.

That is why, when stagnancy becomes the very order of the day in the bourgeois system, socialist system, in the true sense of the term, shows its vitality and dynamism by actually calling the bluff to the neo-Malthusians and all other variants of prophets of decay and gloom in the bourgeois world.

has been plagued by inflationary trend for a decade, more virulence of which was witnessed in later four or five years. In order to contain inflation, the government adopted a package of programme said to be anti-inflationary some eighteen months back. One of the claims of success in support of emergency measures that unlike other capitalist countries, we have been able to contain inflation. But this claim no longer sounds well because there has been a continuous rise in index numbers and the wholesale price index alone has registered a sharp increase by 11 percent. This development has put even those to a somewhat embarrassing situation who clamoured most about the success or the talisman of the package programme which however, not very long, remained package. For while curbs on the wages and incomes of low-paid

wage earners and salaried employees remained that on the industrialists and businessmen were lifted. However that is a separate story.

But fact remains that private corporate sector has been reaping fabulous rate of profit at the cost of poor wage-earners. A recent study of the Reserve Bank of India (BANK's Bulletin—July '76) covering 1,650 companies (with paid up capital of Rs. 5 lakhs and more) shows that while the value of production rose by 28.9%, profits after tax rose by 35.1% in 1974-75. In the previous year also the rate of profit after tax was 21.1% where as the value of output being 11.2%

In both the years, however, the prosperity of the private sector was not because of any appreciable increase of output or other efficiency but due to pricing policy which caused high inflationary trend in

the economy. The Reserve Bank study shows:

First, the inflationary conditions in 1973-74 and 74-75 were as much as the index number of wholesale prices rose by 22.7% in the latter year over the rise of 23.1% in the previous year. The index of manufacture groups rose 16.4% and 23.8% respectively.

Secondly, the beneficial impact of the rise of prices were reaped by the industrialists-monopolists. So, while the value of production of the 1,650 companies studied by the R.B.I. rose by 28.6 percent or by Rs. 2,757 crores, their profit before tax rose by 36.8% or Rs. 273 crores and their after tax profit rose by Rs. 135 crores or by 35.1%. One point comes out unmistakably from this study that the private corporate sector deliberately pushed up price by withholding supplies from the market. This is evident from the fact that some of

the companies or groups of companies pushed up inventory accumulation of finished goods although they reaped high margin of profits. Take for example the companies of chemicals and products group. They increased their profits before tax by 54.1% and after tax by 52.4% at the same time their inventory of finished goods went up by 61.5%.

Thirdly, in this inventory build-up of these companies reaping super profits, the commercial banks including the nationalised banks played the prominent role in providing funds to these companies. The 1650 companies under the study, got the total borrowings jacked up by 21.4% and their short term borrowings by 24%. Thus even after nationalisation of banks the private corporate sector has no difficulty in

(Contd. to Page 8)

## Who Profits by Price Rise

(Contd. from Page 7)

cornering bank finance as in the past.

Fourthly, inflation has further shifted the distribution of the earnings from the poor and fixed income earners to the capitalists. While there has been erosion of real purchasing power of the former, their share over value of production has been on the decline. Decline in the share of remuneration paid to the employees in the value of production has been to 14.8 p.c. in 1974-75 from 15.5 p.c. in 1972-74. By contrast, operating profits as a percentage of value of production rose during the same period, from 5.7% to 6.2%. Employees' remuneration for the 1650 companies under the study of RBI rose by 23.2% whereas operating profits rose by 34.9%, profits before tax by 36.8%, and profits after tax by 35.1% in the same period i.e. during 1974-75. The working class index registered a sharp rise by 26.8% in 1974-75. This was the position before the internal emergency was considered to have arisen. However the fact comes out in bold relief that however much the trade union movement be accused or for that matter the workers are pointed out for their unjustified demands that is said to have been responsible for the state of economy, concrete facts show otherwise. As the RBI study shows that declining trend of worker's share in the value of product is not a new phenomenon in as much as it was only 17.8% in 1960-61 and 17.9% in 1965-66.

The position of the working people can easily be imagined. The measures said to have been taken to contain inflation are directed against rise in money wages as also the provision of bonus the workers have been enjoying for more than two decades, as partial compensation of

## Ban On Students' Union Election

According to a recent directive issued by the Central Government the students will no longer be able to elect their student unions in the context of Emergency. This will remain effective till the Central Government receives a communication from the State Governments concerned.

The rights to elect students unions and conduct student movements on the basis of democratic student organisations have become part of our educational life since the days of British Rule when this right was attained by the student community through arduous struggles. Student Unions are supposed to stand for just demands of the students, like resisting increase of tuition fees, fighting against various corruptions in the educational institutions and high-handed attitude of the authorities affecting the students. These are essential for creating proper academic atmosphere. This is the minimum that the students' unions should do.

Despite the fact that the students' unions have recently become the playground of the ruling party more or less everywhere, the creative role of the students with their bright mental faculties open to newer and newer higher thoughts is fast finding recognition in the society at large and it is for this reason that participation of students in the academic and administrative affairs of educational institution has become an accepted democratic

erosion in real wages. The workers are divested of any means to resist onslaughts against their standard of living by the exploiting capitalist class. The result is obvious enough. The inexorable law of capitalism is asserting from the reverse direction and finding its expression in over-deepening recessionary trend in the economy.

principle in our country as also elsewhere. But for many years we can observe how in some capitalist countries, as the capitalist productive system becomes enmeshed in even deepening and acute crisis the same bourgeoisie who once upheld democratic norms and principles are bringing in all out fascism curtailing the freedom and right of the people and trampling under foot all democratic norms. The same holds true for the educational spheres; educational institutions are fast losing their autonomy while various restrictions are imposed and students have less and less say in any matter. Besides, these countries being class divided, manifestation of antagonistic class contradiction are found even in this field of people's life. The more the ruling bourgeoisie is facing crisis after crisis the more they are taking resort to patronising students' organisations of their own choice to protect their interest even through coercive suppression of democratic rights of the students. This has been a pet pattern in most of the capitalist countries—developed or underdeveloped.

At the time of freedom movement it was our experience that the students and youths played great part in the struggle against foreign oppression and exploitation in this country. Being imbued with newer ideals and newer meaning of life they came out of the educational institute leaving their career and played a most glorious part in these struggles. This participation of students in the national liberation movement and their political rights were then upheld by the national bourgeoisie who in spite of many weaknesses and compromises had at that time progressive aspiration for national independence. But once independence was won they had established their

sway by snatching away those democratic rights which they once stood for. This has become necessary to guard and defend the very exploitative capitalist system from the wrath of the exploited masses. The problem is now, therefore of doing away the capitalist system of production and establishing the socialist system.

This brings us to the question of organising students' movement in the perspective of correct base political line of anti-capitalist socialist revolution built up on the edifice of higher cultural and moral standard. But it is our sad experience that leaving aside this great task set before those student organisations who claim themselves as communists, the students' organisations of our country led by the so-called big left parties did not even feel the minimum necessity of building up students' movements on sound democratic basis and to inculcate among the students a high cultural standard even during their hey day. Rather what they practised was just the other way round. In fact the progressive and revolutionary students' organisations of our country today are paying for the past misdeed of such big left organisations. Judged in this context it can be clearly understood why they have not been able to come forward to build any effective protest upon resistance against such undemocratic decision of the power that be.

Comrade Chhaya Mukherjee, General Secretary, AIDSOS strongly protested against this immediately after this decision was made known and urged upon all concerned to build up a mighty and united student movement to defend and guard the hard won democratic rights of the students.

## Statement of UTUC (Lenin Sarani)

Calcutta 19th January 1977: In a statement issued to the Press, Comrade Sudhindra Kumar Pramanik, President, All India Committee UTUC (Lenin Sarani) said: "Parliamentary democracy, in which the Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi has reiterated her firm faith in her broadcast announcing General Election in March, demands immediate withdrawal of the long continued Emergency and undemocratic restrictions on democratic freedom of press, speech and association and release of political prisoners of all political parties, Trade Union Bodies and other mass organisations at least, in order to promote a democratic and non-repressive atmosphere suitable for any such parliamentary free election".

## PRESS CLIPPING

Prime Minister holds  
Bonus system "illogical"

Mrs. Indira Gandhi, while inaugurating a national convention in New Delhi, on productivity organised by the National Productivity Council, asked industry to think in terms of having "long term productivity agreements" giving incentive to labour and said some earlier decisions which had been hampering efficiency, had now been corrected. It needed, for instance, courage to change the basis of bonus and to link it with productivity. She said, "we know that many sections of workers will not like this decision and that there will be no shortage of people to provoke them. However, we also realised that if we do not change a basically illogical situation, we will only create more trouble for the future."

—Statesman 11. 11. 76.

Editor-in-Chief—NIHAR MUKHERJEE